RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 18 2006

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

In the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA (applicant's admitted prior art, hereinafter "AAPA") in view of Do (US-6,367,007, hereinafter "Do").

Furthermore, Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Do (US-6,367,007, hereinafter "Do") in view of Christeson (US-5,822,581, hereinafter "Christeson").

After the traversing of rejections, Claims 1-10, and 13-14 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA (applicant's admitted prior art) in view of Do (US-6,367,007, hereinafter "Do").

In regards to Claim 1, the following patentable claim limitation (highlighted in bold below) is recited at lines 17-19 of Claim 1: "displaying a user interface of said setup menu **and functions of said system configuration settings selected by the user**".

The office action on page 3 has mistakenly characterize the above to take on a meaning in the following manner: "performing functions of said system configuration settings..." On the other hand, the above patentable claim limitation (highlighted in **bold**)

describes the "displaying .....functions of said system configuration settings selected by the user". Thus, it is the DISPLAYING of the functions of the system configuration settings SELECTED by the user. In other words, NOT all functions are displayed, but only those **that are selected** by the user are displayed, and thus the above patentable limitation is **not** the PERFORMING functions of said system configuration settings as recited in the Office Action.

Pending the allowance of Claim 1, dependent Claim 5 should also be allowed.

In regards to Claim 10, the following recited claim limitation "wherein said reset mode includes resetting a data in said CMOS via an input device" in Claim 12 is patentable over AAPA and Do in view of Christeson because contrary to the alleged remarks on page 5 of the Office Action, the above cited references, including Christeson, have failed to teach the reset mode to be performed via an input device. As a result, the above patentable limitation "wherein said reset mode includes resetting a data in said CMOS via an input device" of Claim 12 is combined with all of the claim limitations of Claim 11 and then incorporated into the amended Claim 10, and Claims 11 and 12 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. As a result, amended Claim 10 includes the above recited limitation "wherein said reset mode includes resetting a data in said CMOS via an input device" and is thus patentable over AAPA, Do in view of Christeson. Therefore, Claim 10 should be allowed.

Pending the allowance of Claim 10, dependent Claim 14 should be allowed.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Do (US-6,367,007, hereinafter "Do") in view of Christeson (US-5,822,581, hereinafter "Christeson").

In regards to dependent Claim 2, the inherited claim limitation "displaying a user interface of said setup menu **and functions of said system configuration settings selected by the user"** from Claim 1 (as previously discussed above) is patentable over AAPA and Do in view of Christeson. Therefore, Claim 2 should be allowed, and dependent Claims 3-4 should also be allowed. Likewise, dependent Claims 6-9 should also be allowed.

In regards to Claim 6, the Office Action recited that the claim limitations in Claim 6 "wherein said step of displaying said user interface and functions includes a backup mode, a loading mode, and a renaming mode" are alleged to be common knowledge well known in the art. As recited in MPEP 2144.03, " It would **not** be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known." Therefore, we do not believe that there are facts which exist "of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known" prior to "the time the invention was made" regarding the "**displaying** said user interface and functions" as claimed in Claim 6, and **not with respect** to "performing said user interface and functions".

In regards to Claim 9, the office action has failed to demonstrate that the teachings of AAPA and Do in view of Christeson have taught the following recited claim limitation in claim 9: "wherein said renaming mode includes allowing the user to rename an item

displayed in said setup menu". The user programming of sub-block with a desired configuration information is **not equivalent** to allowing to rename an item to be also **displayed** in the setup **menu**. The "**displayed in the setup menu**" in the above claim limitation is failed to be taught by AAPA and Do in view of Christeson.

In regards to Claim 12, the following recited claim limitation "wherein said reset mode includes resetting a data in said CMOS via an input device" in Claim 12 is patentable over AAPA and Do in view of Christeson because contrary to the alleged remarks on page 5 of the Office Action, the above cited references, including Christeson, have failed to teach the reset mode to be performed via an input device. As a result, the above patentable limitation "wherein said reset mode includes resetting a data in said CMOS via an input device" of Claim 12 is combined with all of the claim limitations of Claim 11 and then incorporated into the amended Claim 10, and Claims 11 and 12 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. As a result, amended Claim 10 includes the above recited limitation "wherein said reset mode includes resetting a data in said CMOS via an input device" and is thus patentable over AAPA and Do in view of Christeson. Therefore, Claim 10 should be allowed, and amended Claim 13 should also be allowed.

In regards to Claim 13, the highlighted portions **in bold** of the following recited claim limitations "wherein said writing mode includes **writing a backup data in said memory selected by an input device** directly into hardware of said CMOS, and said CMOS saving said backup data in said memory **selected by said input device**" are additionally patentable over AAPA and Do in view of Christeson. Contrary to the remarks on page 5 of the Office Action, the cited references have failed to provide sufficient teachings for "writing a backup data ..... selected by an input device ...., and....

in said memory selected by said input device" in the above patentable claim limitation in Claim 13. As a result, Claim 13 should be allowed.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 18 2006

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,651
Docket No.: 12392-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-10, and 13-14 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : July 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Ding Yu Tan
Registration No.: 58,812

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: USA@jcipgroup.com.tw